# LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

# BRITAIN'S CHOICE

Election Articles by

WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P.
R. PALME DUTT
HARRY POLLITT
WILLIAM RUST
J. R. CAMPBELL
GLADYS DRIVER
Capt. W. ALEXANDER
R. PAGE ARNOT
ARTHUR CLEGG

6D

JULY 1945

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXVII. No. 7

# CONTENTS

July, 1945


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Rouse the Masses by WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P. .... .... .... | 193 |
| Notes of the Month—*Britain's Choice* by R. P. D. .... .... .... | 194 |
| The Communist Party and the Election by HARRY POLLITT .... .... | 197 |
| The Mean Street by WILLIAM RUST .... .... .... .... .... | 202 |
| Finding the Money by J. R. CAMPBELL .... .... .... .... .... | 205 |
| Women and the Elections by GLADYS DRIVER .... .... .... .... | 208 |
| Demands of the Forces by CAPTAIN W. ALEXANDER .... .... .... | 210 |
| Tory Foreign Policy by R. PAGE ARNOT .... .... .... .... | 213 |
| The China Policy of Churchill—and Others by ARTHUR CLEGG .... | 217 |
| The Mare's Nest on Bornholm by OMEGA .... .... .... .... | 218 |
| *Document of the Month*—Communist Election Policy .... .... .... | 220 |
| *Book Review*— | |
| Communist Policy on Agriculture by MAURICE CORNFORTH .... | 223 |


## LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

### Amount received in June, 1945 : £47 : 1 : 5

| | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| C. C. Job | | 3 | 0 |
| S. Mill | | 10 | 0 |
| E. S. Flatters | | 3 | 0 |
| W. Barugh | | 3 | 0 |
| E. S. Stiff | | 5 | 0 |
| H. S. M. | | 2 | 6 |
| S. P. Bent | 4 | 17 | 0 |
| R. F. B. | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| B. Kerridge | | 13 | 0 |
| R. Barrett | | 5 | 0 |
| Socialist Soldier | | 10 | 0 |
| S. Morrissy | | 12 | 0 |
| R. Mecredy | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| B. Vickery | | 10 | 0 |
| Dunoon D.G. | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| D. H. Strathern and Friends | | 8 | 0 |
| T. H. Powell | | 3 | 0 |
| M. Mackay | | 2 | 0 |
| F. Renouf | | 2 | 6 |
| T. Nightingale | | 3 | 0 |
| Old Age Pensioner | | 3 | 0 |
| T. W. R. | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| J. Gibson | | 5 | 0 |
| J. Purton | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| A. Wall | | 5 | 0 |
| G. Robson | | 5 | 0 |
| J. Scott | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| R. Green | | 6 | 6 |
| F. Wagner | | 7 | 0 |
| W. Burbridge | | 2 | 6 |
| Lower Morden D.G. | | 5 | 0 |
| R. Sleep | | 2 | 6 |
| I. C. Martin | | 5 | 0 |
| B. G. Stevens | | 2 | 6 |
| J. Sipkin | | 5 | 0 |
| P. Morris | | 2 | 0 |
| R. G. U., R.A.C. | | 10 | 0 |
| D. Rees | | 10 | 0 |
| Three B.L.A. R.E.M.E's. | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mr. & Mrs. Humphries | | 2 | 6 |
| W. Lakin-Smith | | 2 | 6 |
| V. Lloyd | | 1 | 0 |
| E. Stout | | 5 | 0 |
| V. Smith | | 10 | 0 |
| J. W. Turner | | 4 | 0 |
| K. B. Kay | | 5 | 0 |
| Penrith D.G. | | 5 | 6 |
| Druzya Uchitiellya | | 10 | 0 |
| Director | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| R. N. Millar | | 7 | 6 |
| D. Bassett | | 3 | 6 |
| A. W. Ford | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Anon, Whitchurch | | 1 | 0 |
| J. Macdonald | | 3 | 0 |
| R. Hart | | 10 | 0 |
| Learner | | 2 | 0 |
| V. A. D. | | 5 | 0 |
| S. Nowell | | 1 | 6 |
| Edinburgh D.G. | | 12 | 6 |
| E. T. Wargent | | 13 | 0 |
| E. Connington | | 1 | 5 |
| Eric and Norah | | 10 | 0 |
| C. Gauge | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| M. Elliott | | 3 | 0 |
| J. P. Ellis | | 5 | 0 |
| M. Howe | | 13 | 0 |
| R. Russell | | 5 | 0 |
| R. Anderson | | 7 | 6 |
| J. Pack | | 2 | 6 |
| Gunner, B.L.A. | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| R. Murray | | 3 | 0 |
| J. R. Edwards | | 12 | 0 |
| Socialist Sailor | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| R. R. R. | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Progressive Airman | | 5 | 0 |
| K. M. Jourdain | | 7 | 0 |
| A. E., R.A.O.C. | | 10 | 0 |
| W. J. Potter | | 3 | 0 |
| Radio Mechanic, R.E.M.E. | | 10 | 0 |
| F. E. Stehr | | 5 | 0 |
| W. Maddison | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| E. Reckitt | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Reader | | 5 | 0 |
| G. E. & M. Philibert | | 10 | 0 |
| H. Williams | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| G. Ramsay | | 2 | 6 |
| Anon. | | 6 | 0 |
| Eight of the Boys | | 10 | 0 |
| A. & B. Muskett | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| B. H. Steel | | 10 | 6 |

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# "Rouse the Masses"

*"Rouse the Masses"—often have we heard this call, but never with greater urgency than in this present critical period of our history. The Tories are determined to hold on to everything they have. They will give up nothing. Not only so, but already they are conspiring to put the landlords back into power throughout Europe. The fact that they have now got the notorious reactionary Scottish landowner, Lord Dunglass, as Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs is a glaring indication of what lies ahead, if the Tories get back into power again. Such a notorious hater of the Soviet Union, such a cold-blooded enemy of a progressive policy, is a menace to the peace of Europe, a menace to the progressive forces everywhere. This creature signifies the whole attitude of the Tory Party in international and national affairs.*

*Without the full control of the land by the Government there can be no solution to the housing crisis. The Tories mean to hold on to the land. Destroy the Tory Party, free the land and give the people homes.*

*Without control of the major industries, the Government will be unable to provide employment for the soldiers who are returning to civil life and for the workers who are threatened with redundancy.*

*The health of the people demands a national medical service, but already the Tories are preparing to put Harley Street before the well-being of the people.*

*For homes, health and full employment, for care of the young and care of the old, for safeguarding the progressive forces on the continent and preventing further war, the Tories must be utterly routed.*

*Every member of our Party, every reader of the* Daily Worker, *every shop steward, every trade union official, every co-operator, on the job as never before.*

*"Rouse the Masses." Set in motion a mighty flood of progress that will sweep through and purify the land.*

*For a labour and progressive majority and a future of peace and progress for the people.*

**WILLIAM GALLACHER**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# NOTES OF THE MONTH

## Britain's Choice

THE fight has now opened—the fight for the future of the British people, which is at the same time in no small degree the fight for the future of the world. Which way will Britain go in the post-war world? Will it be the path of progressive democratic development, in harmony and co-operation with the partnership of democratic nations, with the Soviet Union, the United States, the new democratic Governments of Europe and the advancing democratic nations of the world? Will the democratic sections of the people prove politically strong enough to take over the leadership and guide the nation along these paths, which alone hold out hope for Britain's future? Or will the dark forces of reaction, which are already working to undermine the victory and embroil Britain with every democratic country and ally, be allowed to succeed in their crazy design to snatch a new lease of power through a snap election, and then revert to the bankrupt economics and politics of the pre-war era, leading up to an even graver catastrophe than Chamberlain produced? This is the choice which is now before the people of this country. The outcome of this election will powerfully affect this choice. It has been said again and again in anticipation that this election would prove the most serious in Britain's political development. It is a hundred times more serious than any anticipation ever forecast.

## Tory Calculations

Why did Toryism finally decide on the sudden election in July and refuse the reasonable request of all other parties to wait till autumn? The short-term domestic reasons are obvious and have been widely exposed. The Tories are aware of their growing unpopularity and feared a landslide if they waited. They hope to cash in quickly on victory, as in 1918. They hope to cash in on the reputation of Churchill as a war leader before it is tarnished by his peacetime role. They know that an immediate election will rob hundreds of thousands of workers and servicemen of their votes, and that in the event of a close contest this margin of robbed votes may decide the result. Above all, they were aware of the daily rising tide for progressive unity, which was revealed at the Labour Party Conference, when it came within an ace of victory, despite the opposition of the Labour Party Executive; and they were desperately concerned to snatch a quick advantage before the victory of progressive unity would spell finish to their political hopes.

## A Dangerous Game

But these short-term domestic calculations must be seen against the background of the whole international situation and the new trends of Tory policy. From the moment of victory over fascism certain powerful trends of Tory policy have been directed, not by the aims of completing the victory, finishing off the enemy and strengthening the alliance, but by panic fear and hostility against the rising strength of the victorious democratic forces in Europe, and especially against the Soviet Union. These tendencies, which were already manifest in the final stages of the war (the divided V Days, Doenitz, Goering, Kesselring, etc.) first received public expression in sections of Churchill's fateful broadcast of May 13. They were further demonstrated in Eden's provocative performance at San Francisco, winning the wild enthusiasm of the Hearst press; the obstruction to the fulfilment of the Crimea Agreement on Poland; the sabre-rattling against Tito; the utilisation of the Syria incidents to bully De Gaulle; the arrest of anti-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fascist leaders in Northern Italy; and the disruptive tactics in Austria and support of fascist armed formations in Carinthia. The ugly impression created by these performances was confirmed in the eyes of world opinion by the composition of the Caretakers' Government, in which the principal leader of the Anti-Crimea Opposition and the principal open supporter of Franco-fascism were ostentatiously taken into key junior positions in the War Office and Foreign Office. Altogether a dangerous game is being played by Toryism while public opinion is distracted by the election.

**Forging a Mandate**

This line of policy, once it is realised by public opinion, will arouse a storm of anger and fury, compared with which Greece was a ripple. It is directly contrary to the whole trend of public opinion. Its outcome, if it were allowed to be carried to a conclusion, would represent a betrayal of everything for which the people fought. It is in contradiction to every vital national interest of Britain. Its authors and sponsors in the Tory Central Office are therefore desperately concerned to rush through an election before the full implications of this policy are realised, in order that they may then claim a popular "mandate" for their devious manoeuvres.

**1935 and 1945**

In this respect the tactics of the present election repeat the old device of 1935. In 1935 the Tories won their majority on the basis of their proclamation of firm and undeviating adherence to the principles of collective security for the defence of Abyssinia against Italian fascist aggression; and, having won their majority, proceeded to sign the Hoare-Laval Pact for carving up Abyssinia and to pursue the whole line of policy which led to Munich. In 1945 the Tories seek to win their majority as the heroes of victory over fascism and the representatives of the unity of the Big Three, in order that, having won their majority in the elections, they may have a free hand to pursue their policy, which would undermine the foundations of that victory and imperil the maintenance of that unity.

**World Strategy of Reaction**

This election itself is only a part of the grand total strategy of Toryism in the present phase; and this grand total strategy is dictated by fear of the political awakening and advance of the people equally in Britain and in Europe and the world. This is the strategy which must be defeated at the present election. Tory policy has thrown a question-mark over the whole future of Britain's role in the eyes of world opinion, and even of the continuance of loyalty to the basis of Crimea. The result of the elections must decisively eliminate this question-mark.

**World Democratic Strength**

The foundations of the Teheran and Crimea policies, of the democratic partnership of nations for the final destruction of fascism and building of world co-operation will not be so easily shaken by the manoeuvres of a weakening and unrepresentative reactionary section in this country. This is no longer the world of Munich, nor of Castlereagh. It is the world of victory over fascism when the power of the peoples, with the working-class at their head, is being demonstrated as never before. The French elections are only the foretaste of the rising popular tide in Europe. The Soviet Union can proudly proclaim:—

> The Soviet Union is a great democratic Power with sufficient might not only for the security of her own frontiers, but also to provide security for the peoples of Europe. The sooner this is realised by our friends and by our enemies, the better it will be for all humanity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would appear that the method recommended by certain Tory reactionaries, as an apology for their outrageous provocations and slander campaigns, that "talking tough" is the way to impress the Soviet Union has not been successful in its objective.

**United States Warning**

Even the hopes of the Tory troublemakers to draw the United States into their trap, and to stage an Anglo-American line-up in opposition to the Soviet Union, has not met with the expected success. It is true that the American gutter press, the tabloids, the Hearst press, the former Isolationist press, which used to pour out praise of Hitler and bespatter Britain with venomous abuse during the war years, now vies even with the Franco press in its rapturous adoration of Churchill and Eden and the present Tory Government and its policies; and these encomia from the sewer are solemnly reproduced in big headlines in the newspapers here in order to give the impression that American opinion demands the return of Toryism to power. But the real picture of responsible American opinion is very different.

**A Plain Rebuff**

Stettinius's broadcast of May 28 (which painfully "surprised" British delegates, according to the *Daily Telegraph*) so far from falling into the trap of the Anglo-American line-up against the Soviet Union, blandly offered American good offices to reconcile Britain with the Soviet Union—thus sufficiently indicating a different view of the source of the trouble. This was further emphasised by the special reference of appreciation to the role of Molotov at the San Francisco Conference. The rebuff was driven home by the appointment of the American Missions to Moscow and London, by which the principal trusted adviser of Roosevelt and champion of Crimea, Harry Hopkins, was sent to Moscow, while to London was sent the former Moscow Ambassador, Davies, the warm advocate of friendship with the Soviet Union and unsparing public critic of Munichism in Britain.

**Our Chance**

Thus there is no escaping the plain lesson from the entire present international situation. The peoples of the world are looking to us to do a job in Britain in this election. It is the more important to emphasise this, because of the glaring falsification of the world position and world opinion which is being presented in an important part of the press at the present moment for election purposes. The democratic peoples of the world are looking to the British people to clear away the reactionary scum which has too long obscured the true face of Britain, and which through all these years they have had to put up with, work with and negotiate with, only for lack of a better alternative.

**Now is the Time**

Our chance is here. The moment has come for which we have had to wait ten years. The moment has come when the swindle election of 1935, with its resulting Munichite majority which we have had to suffer these ten years, can be avenged and the Tory enemies of the people cleared out of parliament. The moment has come when a majority of democratic representatives, of representatives of the labour movement, including Communists, can be returned to parliament in order to establish a new government which will place Britain in the front ranks of progressive nations. This election is the indispensable sequel of victory over fascism. We must complete that victory by defeating Tory reaction at home. It is not enough to acclaim the new Left Governments in Europe. It is not enough to acclaim the achievements of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Soviet Union or the democratic victory over isolationism in the American elections. We need in Britain, above all, a new Government which shall truly represent the outlook and aspirations of the people and prove a worthy and powerful partner of the democratic Governments and democratic forces of Europe and the world. In the conditions of the present election the indispensable guarantee to ensure such a new Government is the return of a Labour and Communist majority to the coming parliament.

R. P. D.

*June* 4, 1945.

# The Communist Party and the Election *

## by HARRY POLLITT

***(Communist Parliamentary Candidate for Rhonnda East)***

I propose to deal with four points:—

1. Some comments on the present situation.
2. An assessment of the Labour Party Conference.
3. The General Election.
4. Some arguments in relation to our policy.

*THE PRESENT SITUATION*

Since April great new events have taken place. The victory over fascism in Europe transcends everything else. There is the significance of the French elections. The Oaklands Trade Union Conference has produced a draft for the World Trade Union Federation, to come up for ratification in Paris next September. The San Francisco Conference is still in session. Finally has come the announcement of the General Election.

### Roosevelt's Death

There is a certain deterioration in the international situation, but we should not be surprised at this. We knew that the political and moral destruction of fascism was as great a task as its military defeat. When one of the world's greatest anti-fascists dies, one of the architects of Crimea, undoubtedly reaction both at home and abroad receives a new incentive to sow discord and confusion. We must recognise the significance of the moves to the right of President Truman and of Churchill.

But to believe that because of a series of disquieting happenings the Crimea decisions are in abeyance, would be a great error. The Crimea decisions are not based on three men, but on the political and economic interests of the three countries they represent. The necessity for the decisions still exists and they will be fulfilled. We are in a situation where it is absolutely essential that we should retain a balanced judgment and see the situation as a whole. We should not come to any hasty conclusions and should avoid political provocation.

### San Francisco

San Francisco has not failed, as so many revolutionary and powerful interests have worked to achieve. The marvel is that with 47 nations so much *has* been accomplished. There was a summary of the outstanding achievements of San Francisco in the press this morning. We ought to take a certain inspiration because of the moral leadership of the delegation of the Soviet Union at San Francisco.

Undoubtedly there has been a certain deterioration in the relations between the Soviet Union and Britain and America. There is evidence of the

* Report of speech delivered to a special meeting of the Executive Committee, district organisers and parliamentary candidates of the Communist Party on May 25th, 1945.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great concern this is causing both here and in the Soviet Union.

### Causes for Suspicion

Churchill set the tone to certain aspects of the new problems arising in his victory broadcast after V-Day. The gospel of "talking rough" to the Russians is not confined to the Tories—neither is the fear of a new Europe influenced by the Soviet Union confined to the Tory Party.

What are the reasons for the suspicions between Britain and the U.S.S.R.? They were evidenced in the complete mess-up of the announcement of V-Day—on one day in Great Britain and on another day by the U.S.S.R.

The problems which cause suspicion in certain circles in Britain are Poland, Austria, Trieste, the fact that the Soviet Union was determined upon the political and moral destruction of fascism, and the response of the people in the areas liberated by the Red Army to the Soviet Union.

In the Soviet Union they suspect British policy in Greece, the treatment of Doenitz, the Flensburg "government," the mollycoddling of Goering, the attempts to compare Soviet democracy with totalitarian regimes, the slowness with which war criminals are being brought to trial. These matters, which are worrying people in the Soviet Union, are precisely the same as those which are worrying anti-fascists all over the world.

### Slander Campaign

There is at the moment a terrific slander campaign going on against the Soviet Union. At no time since 1940 has the press shown such persistence in trying to sow confusion and discord in relation to the Soviet Union. There is a great deal of talk about "the next war will be with Russia," that the Polish army is ready to march into Russia, etc.

Stalin's letter to *The Times*, taken in conjunction with Molotov's and Manuilski's stand at San Francisco, shows the strength of the Soviet Union and the firmness of its policy for peace and democratic co-operation. We must emulate this spirit in defending the interests of the British people and for the restoration of Europe. Our general line, as in particular evidenced by the events since Crimea, will prove in the light of events to be absolutely correct. The new situation demands a change in emphasis for the General Election.

We must not forget, and must keep in the foreground, two points :—

1. The political struggle in Britain cannot be resumed in 1945 at the point at which it was left in 1939.

2. The character of the gigantic problems on the agenda for solution : victory over Japan, the problem of security, the reorganisation of British industry, the restoration of Europe, and co-operation in the economic field.

### Which Solution ?

The immediate line of our fight, and also the problems I have mentioned, are of such a character that it is of tremendous significance as to whether they are solved in the way of the common people or in the way of the monopolists. I believe that no one Party or group can tackle these problems.

### *THE BLACKPOOL LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE*

This conference was naturally dominated by the political crisis that arose last weekend. The vote on unity could not have been taken in more unfavourable circumstances. The Standing Orders Committee would not allow the large unions the opportunity of placing resolutions on unity on the Standing Orders paper. So the arguments in favour of unity could not be argued from a political point of view, but only by the reference back of the Standing Orders Committee report.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This was done just after Ellen Wilkinson's presidential speech, before the tellers had been elected for votes at the conference and for the election of the E.C. and was taken in an atmosphere of some confusion. Tanner moved the reference back and was seconded by Hallsworth. The fact that leading members of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress had taken this step was of tremendous significance. The vote was 1,219,000 for to 1,314,000 against — a majority of 95,000 against. This vote had a tremendous effect on the conference at the time and right up to the close of the conference.

If this vote had not gone so close, Laski's statement would not have been made: "Labour will not enter a coalition with the Tories after the General Election, whatever the state of Parties. As to the issue of joining with other people, I beg the Conference not to tie the hands of the Party."

This vote has also an important bearing on the question of Communist Party affiliation, which will come up for decision in 1946.

*THE GENERAL ELECTION*

We cannot discuss this question unless we get a picture of what we are up against. 641 new members are to be elected. This means Labour has to win 321 for a majority.

The following was the position in past elections:—

| *Year* | *Administration* | *Majority* |
|---|---|---|
| 1935 | Tory .... .... | 247 |
| 1931 | *Tory .... .... | 495 |
| 1929 | Labour .... .... | 22 |
| 1924 | Tory .... .... | 211 |

These figures show the immensity of the task before us.

The figures in the present Parliament are 401 reactionaries, 193 Labour and Progressive, 21 Independent.

In 1935 the Tories had 35 per cent. of the votes and 70 per cent. of the seats; 48 M.Ps. were returned in three-cornered fights—33 of them were Tories. In 1935 the Liberals contested 157 seats: in 1945 they are contesting 300. In 1945 the Tories are contesting 600 seats, Labour 600, Liberals 300, C.P. 22, Common Wealth between 40 and 60, Independents 10.

**A Terrific Task**

It will be a terrific task to win a Labour majority. We should remember the difficulties of a General Election between two wars—between the end of the war in Europe and that in Japan. We should remember that the outstanding feature of the return of Roosevelt was the unwillingness of the American soldiers to change their Commander in Chief because it might prolong the war.

We should remember that in comparison with this election the Zinoviev Letter Election will be a pleasant Sunday afternoon. We should note the Tory tactics in Canada, and the fact that the press is playing up to the alarm that is reported from certain quarters in America in case Churchill is defeated.

**Three Points**

There are three points we should remember as a guide to our propaganda:—

1. The political awakening of the people.

2. The realisation that Churchill has never been trusted by the working-class of this country. They do not trust him, except as a war-leader. This is a contrast to what was felt for Roosevelt.

3. The Tories are banking on using dashing tank commanders and submarine officers. Our reply must be that millions of the people, whether soldiers or civilians, who have been through the blitz, are just as much

* Called "National Government" because National Liberals and National Labour (Macdonaldites) and others were included.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heroes as dashing young officers, and defeat this trick.

We shall strike a note of confidence in the working-class. On national unity and the character of a new Government our position is known and our position is abundantly justified. The chief issue now is the defeat of the Tory Party, and the results of the election will settle the character of Government and national unity.

There are some propaganda arguments that can be used in the course of the campaign.

1. There is not one thing in the Twelve Point Tory programme that they could not have carried out between the two wars if they had wanted to—they had big majorities, and could have done so.

2. It is the Tory Party that is responsible for the rise of fascism in the world.

### The Nation Won

3. Not one man—but the nation, in which the working-class is the majority, has won the war.

4. There is enormous capital for Labour and Communist candidates in popularising the role of the Soviet Union. Just as its policy and its 15,000,000 casualties have played the chief role in winning the war, so its policy now is the chief guarantee of the winning of a permanent peace. We should take the offensive on this.

5. We should spread the knowledge of political awakening in Europe and popularise the role of the resistance movements and their power in the new governments. We should stress the lives that have been saved by national unity and working-class unity in the occupied coutries. Especially important is the result of the French elections.

### World War III

6. On all this gossip about "war with the U.S.S.R.," we must deal with the role of the working-class—we know that they will not go and fight the Red Army.

7. Our economic policy alone can save Britain from becoming one of the world's distressed areas. We must prove, on the basis of the facts, the case for nationalisation. Our policy, as set out in *How to Win the Peace* and in leaflets, etc., must be brought home to the people. We must give the facts and show that our policy is necessary to save Britain. Undoubtedly one of the weaknesses of the Blackpool conference was the failure to realise the changed position of Britain in relation to America, Canada and other countries. If the working-class wants higher wages, shorter hours and so on, this all depends on our economic position.

### Defeating Japan Quickly

8. On the question of a speedy victory over Japan—speedy victory in Japan requires speedy defeat of Tories. We must show the effect of their policy in India, Malaya, Burma. Churchill's tactic of bringing the election on earlier means the creation of two months of confusion and doubt in the minds of the war workers.

9. The forces and their relatives need the help of the Labour Party. There is a strong feeling among the electors on the position of servicemen: and this feeling was brought out, even though it meant a defeat of the Executive by the Labour Conference resolution on war gratuities.

### Tory Foreign Policy

10. Tory foreign policy is a familiar story—the story of Spain, Abyssinia, China. Tory foreign policy caused the war and can lose the peace. The new Europe demands a new Britain.

11. The Party must prevent the term "Nation" being part of Tory propaganda. We are the nation, and the best defenders of its interests.

12. Shall Britain's resources be used for the needs of the people or for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

benefit of the monopolists. Churchill has chosen the monopolists.

13. Where Labour leaders attack the Communist Party we should have no hesitation in replying. When will some of these leaders stop hating communism more than they hate capitalism? Their policy is preventing a united working-class movement which could move forward to victory and socialism.

14. Crimea is not dead. Roosevelt is dead, Churchill has changed, but Stalin is alive, and so is the U.S.S.R. The Crimea decisions are decisions to which the Soviet Union has put its hand, and will not go back on.

**World Trade Unions**

15. The peace is not going to be the same as last time. Big positive gains have been won. Victory over fascism has been achieved. Socialism and democracy have been successfully defended. There is a stronger labour movement in this country and the U.S.A. There are 27 million trade unionists in the Soviet Union. A world Trade Union Federation has been established—this would not have been thought possible a year ago. There is a new Europe. San Francisco has many positive achievements to its credit. The political consciousness of millions of people in this country has been deepened. Tory tactics now are determined by the fact that they understand better what has been won than many of the members of the labour movement. They are afraid of the position of the labour movement and of the Soviet Union.

16. We must launch terrific blows against the Tory Party. Every member of our Party must set a personal example, whether we fight for our own candidates or whether we offer help to the Labour Party. Our offer of help to the Labour Party will be unconditional. There will be no conditions for helping the Labour candidates.

The fate of Britain depends on the General Election. We fought for the Second Front and were slandered and maligned—we won it, but only just in time. If we had not won when we did five shells a minute would have been falling on London.

**Vision of Socialism**

It is an integral part of our work that we must give the people a vision of what socialism means in this country. We must rouse up class feeling. We must make the people really hate Tory rule, and this will be of enormous value to us after the General Election. We must strengthen the Labour Party, the Communist Party, the trade unions and the Co-operatives.

The gauntlet has been thrown down —we pick it up in order to win.

We have the greatest chance our Party ever had to save the labour and progressive movement and the development of the new world that is now being born. We must be proud to take advantage of the opportunity lying before us.

*The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.*

*The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.*

*SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 months 7s. Postage paid. Abroad, 8s. from LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.*

*A stencilled Discussion Guide to the magazine is available to readers at 3s. a year inclusive of postage.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Mean Street

## by WILLIAM RUST

*(Communist Parliamentary Candidate for South Hackney)*

HOUSING conditions in Britain have been the subject of controversy and exposure for over one hundred years, but it was not until the end of World War No. 1 that housing stepped into the political arena as one of the central questions of the day.

The worsening of housing conditions over a long period and the accumulated neglect of the war years reached that point in 1918 where housing became politics and "Homes for Heroes" one of the battle cries of the first post-war General Election.

"One of the first tasks of the Government will be to deal on broad and comprehensive lines with the housing of the people, which during the war has fallen so sadly into arrears, and upon which the well-being of the nation so largely depends," declared Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Lloyd George in their joint election manifesto of 1918. State responsibility for housing construction was recognised for the first time.

Even the palace deigned to notice the cottage. "The first point at which the attack must be delivered is the unhealthy, ugly, overcrowded house in the mean street," declared King George V from Buckingham Palace in April, 1919. Maybe His Majesty was also concerned with other aspects of the question, for he went on to state that "if 'unrest' is to be converted into contentment, the provision of good houses may prove one of the most potent agents in that conversion. . . ."

But neither Lloyd George nor King George was able to deliver the goods.

The Labour Party claimed that the nation needed a million new houses immediately, but by June, 1922, nearly four years after the ending of the war, only 161,442 houses had been built. It was not until 1935, nearly seventeen years after the ending of the war, that the annual construction of houses reached the 350,000 mark.

During the inter-war period, 4,334,328 houses were built, of which 1,332,189 goes to the credit of the local authorities, who had entered this field for this first time. The local authorities tackled the slums, but the main attack of private enterprise was not delivered against the "mean street."

According to Sir E. D. Simon, the number of middle-class houses was increased by 75 per cent. and the number of working-class houses by only 30 per cent. in the inter-war period. *The Times* states that "statistics show that only four in every ten houses built since the last war were within the means of working-class families." (February 3, 1945.) The speculative builder provided most of the houses which were constructed between the wars, but under one-twelfth of his output were built for letting.

### Tory Failure

This failure of the Tories to provide working-class houses indicates the character of the housing problem today. Pre-war building went a long way to meet the demands of the better-off section of the community, but the needs of the workers were left largely unsatisfied. Despite the efforts of the local authorities the extent of the slums remained terrifyingly large.

In Manchester alone it is officially estimated by the City Council that 68,000 houses, 38 per cent. of the total, must be regarded as slums. In Birmingham, the City Engineer has declared that no less than one-third of the houses will have to be condemned. On the basis of these and other figures it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is safe to estimate a round figure of four million slum houses in Britain today.

The Tories have held political power for nearly a quarter of a century, but they have not abolished the slums. The "broad and comprehensive policy" of 1918 has yet to be carried through.

To the state of affairs that existed at the outbreak of the war must now be added the damage done by enemy action and the effects of the suspension of normal building and of all normal repair work for a period of nearly six years.

Houses destroyed or rendered uninhabitable by enemy action total over 500,000. In addition, over four million houses have been damaged. There is not only an acute shortage of houses, but millions of our people are ekeing out an existence under conditions which almost defy description.

The housing situation following the last war which produced such expressions of alarm and consternation from Lloyd George and King George was a semi-paradise compared with the grave and desperate situation which faces the nation today. But what are the Tories proposing to do?

### Sales Talks

Admittedly, they have expressed their deep concern and have promised to work wonders. But, then, they are experts at delivering sales talks to the politically trustful. In the sphere of action they have extremely little to offer.

During the first two years after the ending of the war it is proposed to build, or to have building 300,000 permanent houses and 145,000 temporary houses. The long term housing programme is spread over a period of ten to twelve years during which three to four million houses are to be built.

Even if realised this programme would in no way satisfy the urgent needs of the people and it has been roundly condemned in Parliament. The demand for the appointment of a Minister of Housing finds strong support amongst the public.

Just as the present housing situation can in no way be compared to that existing in 1918, so have the opportunities for the carrying through of a speedy housing programme immeasurably improved. It is the glaring contrast between the piecemeal plans and the vast technical possibilities that constitutes the chief source of public indignation.

The needs of the war have given a big impetus to industry and technique. Building workers have done a remarkable job in the rapid construction of factories and aerodromes, and of the famous Mulberry harbours. Civil engineering has made amazing progress in the utilisation of new materials and the large-scale factory production of housing parts which can be assembled on the site. In addition, it is now established that our factories can turn out kitchen equipment, baths, plumbing units, stoves, refrigerators, washing machines, etc., on the basis of mass production and at cheap rates.

Houses built after the last war did not keep pace with the march of technical progress. In general, they were too small and their fittings were inadequate, many were jerry-built and planning was defective.

Providing that the resources of the country are fully utilised and the new technique widely applied, it will be possible after this war to build houses of a new type, model houses which will revolutionise the lives of millions.

With such favourable technical possibilities, what, then, is holding up the building of houses?

### Tory Attitude

Firstly, the attitude of the Tories to the land question. Legislation on land has been shelved with the result that local authorities are unable to obtain the sites they need at reasonable prices

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to embark on schemes of community planning.

Even in the East End of London local authorities have to pay up to £40,000 per acre for building sites. On many of the L.C.C. housing estates annual interest payments alone amount to more than the gross yearly rent.

Secondly, the refusal of the Tories to give State assistance to an extensive development programme in the building and civil engineering industries. The scattered building industry (80,000 separate firms) is not equipped to carry through a large scale building programme at top speed. It should be made to work to a plan and State factories should be provided for the mass production of housing parts and fittings.

The Tories are violently opposed, on principle, to State control and will not lift a finger against the vested interests involved, especially the building rings. The result is muddle, confusion, uncertainty and, above all, high prices.

Thirdly, the Tories refuse to tackle the financial aspects of the housing programme. Unless the price of land is reduced, building costs cut and the local authorities are enabled to obtain loans at low rates of interest, there is the danger that rents will soar out of the reach of the ordinary worker.

It is reliably estimated that on the basis of present prices a standard worker's house in London could not be let at under 35s. per week plus rates.

Local authorities cannot get on with their job unless they are able to obtain loans at a low rate of interest. The annual interest charge on a £1,000 house at 5 per cent. is £50 and at 2 per cent. £20. The difference in weekly rent would be 12s.

The Tories, fighting against social change and jealous of the growing power of the people, stand obstinately opposed to a State-guided housing programme. Leave houses to the free working of private enterprise is their battle-cry. The Tories do not want to see the local authorities carrying out a successful building programme. They want to increase the power of the wealthy building societies and to encourage the purchase of houses in the belief that house-owners are more likely to vote Tory than municipal tenants.

### Communist Demands

In this situation the Communist Party is calling for an all-out attack on the slums and the carrying through of a great programme of house building for the people. The Communist Party demands:—

1. The setting up of a Ministry of Housing in order to end the present departmental overlapping, establish control over the building and civil engineering industries, expand production and regulate prices.

2. The immediate introduction of a Land Bill providing for the compulsory purchase of all land needed for the building programme and the leasing of same to the local authorities.

3. Local authorities to be placed in complete control of all building developments in the area, and to be equipped with powers to ensure community planning.

4. Issue of Government housing loans to local authorities graded up to not more than 2 per cent.; and in the case of blitzed areas and areas in special need, loans to be free of interest.

5. Government subsidies to be paid so long as necessary in order that local authorities may let houses at rents which workers can afford.

6. Expansion of labour force in the industry, the setting up of Joint Production Committees and the introduction of a guaranteed week and a minimum wage for all building trade workers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Tories have failed in their simple duty to provide houses for the common people. They must be swept on one side and replaced by a Government, led by Labour, which will build millions of new homes for the people and finally destroy the pigsties and bug hutches which still infest our land.

# Finding the Money

## by J. R. CAMPBELL

(*Communist Parliamentary Candidate for Greenock*)

"HOW are we to find the money for all these reforms?" will be amongst the most frequently asked questions at the General Election. The more reactionary section of the Tories will of course try to demonstrate that the higher the cost of social reforms the greater will be the burden on industry, and the consequent unemployment.

During the debates on the Beveridge report in 1943, Mr. Arthur Greenwood referred to money as a "meaningless symbol." This phrase torn from its context, will no doubt be worked to death by Tory candidates at the General Eelection. For the notes which the workers receive in their pay packets are hardly meaningless. A pound note will mean more than it does today, if prices can be kept at the present level, and the amount of goods which the workers can buy at present prices are increased. It will mean less than it does today, if the Government, following the policy enunciated by Sir John Anderson in his Budget speech allows prices to rise. The working class movement must in the post-war years keep a close watch on the relations of money and prices.

But Mr. Greenwood was enunciating an important truth which was that whether a country can afford any given amount of social reform, should be decided not by the amount of money standing to the credit of its citizens in the banks, but by the volume of real wealth which is produced in its industries.

### Production per Head

Thus when counting its millions of people unemployed, with great industries working below capacity, it will find it difficult to afford many things, that it could do with ease if its workers were fully employed, and the capacity of its industries used to the full. Equally a country with full employment, but with a low level of production per worker employed, will not be able to undertake the reforms that would be possible in a country with a higher level of output per worker employed, and with full employment of its resources. So it is the level of production in general, and the level of production per head in particular, that has got to be looked at, in estimating a country's ability to afford any particular level of social service expenditure.

The crucial question therefore is, has Britain's capacity to produce wealth declined during the war, so that it is less able to embark on increased expenditure on social reforms than previously?

According to the Budget White Paper for 1944, the gross national product at market value increased from £5,682 millions in 1938 to £10,089 in 1945. This does not mean that actual wealth production has increased by the difference between those two figures, for the 1945 figure also reflects increases in prices.

From tables given in another part of the White Paper, it is possible to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deduce that the price of consumers' goods has increased by 51 per cent.

No figures are available to show precisely the increase in price of goods sold to the Government for war purposes, or the increased price of capital goods, but the *Economist* has made a calculation that they have probaby increased by 37½ and 45 per cent. respectively.

Using these figures, it is possible to reduce the value of the gross national product of 1944 to the level that it would have been at, had the increase in prices not occurred.

### Increase of Real Wealth

Thus the gross national product in 1938 was £5,682 million and in 1944 £6,990 million in terms of 1938 prices—an increased production of real wealth by 23 per cent.

If we can maintain this increase when industry is transferred to a peace footing, and there is no reason why we should fail to do so, then we can easily carry all the projected social reforms.

In an appendix to the Beveridge Report on Full Employment, Mr. Nicholas Kaldor has given his estimate of the size of a post-war budget.

He assumes that the Beveridge Report on Social Security and the Education Act are adopted; that any additional expenditure which might otherwise fall on the local authorities is borne by the State, and that the burden of those social security services which now fall on the local authorities is assumed by the State.

Interest on the national debt, he assumes, will rise from £200 million per annum in 1938 to £500 million per annum in 1948 and defence services will rise from £379 million in 1938 to £480 million in 1948, and war factories will rise from £40 million per annum to £100 million per annum.

Mr. Kaldor therefore calculates that the peace-time Budget of 1948, out of which most of the reforms now advocated can be financed, will be £1,685 millions, as compared with £1,013 millions in 1938.

We believe that this budget is on the low side. It makes no allowance for expenditure on food subsidies to keep the price of food low. These cost £220 million in 1944. While increased efficiency in British agriculture and a reduction in food prices abroad will in time enable us to reduce those subsidies, this is not an immediate possibility.

There is also no allowance for housing subsidies, which will be necessary in the first post-war years at any rate.

### £2,000 Million Budget

A more realistic peace-time budget would be one around £2,000 million per annum, or practically double that of 1938. Such a budget would be 22 per cent. of the taxable income of the country, provided income remained at the present level. This is the same percentage as 1938.

At the present time we are raising £3,134 million by taxation, so that this budget should permit quite substantial reductions in taxation to be made.

£477 million of this sum is excess profits tax, which is due to cease after the war. Not all this will be direct relief to the employing class, because their profits, and therefore their liability to income tax and super tax will increase. But it is notable that the employers are the first section of the community to be earmarked for tax relief.

The balance of argument is against continuing E.P.T. in peace-time, but here is a case for replacing it with an increased national defence contribution, or by an annual capital tax.

### Wage-Earners' Income Tax

In my opinion, the first thing that a Labour government should turn its attention to is the virtual abolition of the income tax on the weekly wage earner.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What this income tax means can be seen from the following facts. The increase of real output on the part of the workers is 23 per cent. above pre-war. Income tax, however, has helped to prevent any part of this increased output being reflected in real earnings.

Here are the facts. Working-class earnings, because of overtime, Sunday work and intensified productive effort, are 83 per cent. above pre-war. After income tax is deducted, the workers' earnings are only 54 per cent. above pre-war. As the prices of consumers' goods are 51 per cent. above pre-war, this means that real earnings, as compared with pre-war, have not increased at all.

**Personal Allowances**

All the results of the workers' increased output have been taken away from them by income tax.

There is a solid case for relieving the worker and the lower middle class professional man of the crushing burden of income tax.

This could be done by restoring the pre-war exemption limits, and personal allowances with regard to income tax.

In addition, there should be a sharp reduction of the taxes on beer, tobacco, spirits and entertainment.

Should income tax falling on the very rich be reduced?

Here two facts must be borne in mind. The abrogation of excess profits tax and the repayment of 20 per cent. of that tax means a considerable increase in the income of this group. It is quite undesirable to place in their hands any spending power which they might use indiscriminately. In my opinion, the only tax remission in addition to the abrogation of E.P.T. that is necessary would be to make increased allowances for actual capital extensions undertaken by business men. Some tax reductions for those who want to spend on the extension of their business is desirable, but no tax remissions to enable individuals to increase their luxury expenditure.

**Checking Luxury Spending**

The desirability of checking luxury expenditure in the immediate post-war years justifies the retention of a modified purchase tax, on a limited amount of luxury goods.

Such a budget would improve the condition of the working-class, and lower middle class taxpayers and worsen that of the rich, as compared with the pre-war budgets. For that reason it could only be carried through by a government dominated by the Labour and progressive forces.

# Is this Trusteeship?

Compulsory enrolment of the European population over 18 years of age was started last month in Kenya. The Chief Commandant of the Auxiliary Police Force recently gave an interview to the press of East Africa in which he stated that he was determined that the force shall "not be messed about." His aim is to organise the force so that in an "emergency" it can be called together at short notice. The members of the force will have adequate arms and will be fully trained in their use. He stated that he was trying to get armoured cars.

The Chief Commandant, in reply to questions, made it clear that the kind of emergency he was planning to have to deal with was "native troubles." The force was, therefore, to be specially trained in bush and street warfare and "generally will be trained to deal with any trouble that is likely to arise in Kenya."

(Taken from *East African Standard*, April 26, 1945.)

*NOTE:* there was no conscription of the whites for the war against fascism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Women and the Elections

## by GLADYS DRIVER

*(Communist Parliamentary Candidate for Harrow East)*

WHAT was the Victorian conception of woman's role? Passivity, suffering and all struggle left to the men. Women today repudiate such a role. In this last war women have taken their place in the struggle to defeat the fascist enemy and it is an accepted fact that without them victory would not have been achieved. In every sphere of the nation's effort they have played a part, in the forces, in the factory, on the land, in defence and welfare, in transport, and in administration, and coupled with all these in the home, being wives and mothers and carrying the burden of preserving the nation's morale. The experience and the achievement have resulted in a broadened outlook and in a questioning, "What does the future hold for us?" which women are determined to have a hand in answering.

### A Fuller Life

Confident in the knowledge that they possess ability, skill, initiative and endurance, a knowledge gained during the difficult years of war when women were called upon to perform the same jobs as men under the same conditions of black-out, blitz and bad transport, women today intend to use those same attributes in the building of the Britain they want to live in. They have learned the value of organisation. They understand the working of a democratic labour movement. They see the great achievements of the unions and have responded to the appeal to become organised in the same way as the men and with the men to go forward into the struggle for a better standard of living.

This all-round broadening of women's activity and interest has meant a fuller life for women and consequently they are better mothers and their children will benefit enormously from the wider outlook in the home. Mothers understand more of politics and will play a bigger part in the struggle to achieve a happy future for their children. The realisation of the need for struggle means that they will become better citizens and will play a greater part in public affairs.

### What Women Want

What do women want? The war with the worry, the waste, the bereavement, the broken homes and all the suffering attendant upon these, has emphasised the need for peace. That is the first cry and the spontaneous communal VE-Day celebrations in the streets and squares of our towns and cities was the expression of that longing for peace. The few days of merry-making, the happy gatherings of families and neighbours, the relaxation and relief from the strain of war and war-time duties gave the first taste of peace-time life and enjoyment. But now thoughts are turning to post-war problems and the first of these is the question of full employment, a job for every father, husband, son and sweetheart and a job for every woman who wants to continue working. Not only is full employment at an adequate wage necessary to prevent poverty and all its accompanying evils of malnutrition, ill-health and frustration for the individual, but the continued employment of women is necessary for the full utilisation of the resources of the nation and for the production of sufficient goods for post-war Britain. Progressive opinion, as well as the Communist Party, recognises that the principle of the rate for the job must be established if women are to be attracted into employment and are to be safeguarded from undercutting the men by cheap labour. Equality of pay, of opportunity and of training is the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demand and the right of the women so that they may continue in peace to make as great a contribution to the national life as they did in war.

Thousands of women today are dreaming of the home they hope to build. Some have had a home and lost it in the blitz. Some have never had a home to themselves but have had to share the inconveniences and irritations of crowded out-of-date houses. Some are newly wed and some are hoping to wed. Their needs must be satisfied. The Government muddle on housing must have proved to the women that the Tories are not concerned with the building of a happy home life for the masses, and they must look to a Labour and progressive Government to take the necessary measures to provide well-equipped houses where arrangements are such that children can be reared in a happy atmosphere.

**Health**

Women want children, but they want also to be given the facilities for safe motherhood, healthy babies and happy toddlers. These conditions can only come from healthy bodies, good attention in ante-natal and maternity institutions, in the provision of crèches and nurseries and in grants and family allowances. Richard Titmuss, in his book *Birth, Poverty and Wealth*, shows that the social position and occupation of the father seriously affect the health of the mothers. Married women in the middle and upper classes have a much lower ratio of deaths from diseases like bronchitis, tuberculosis and syphilis than those in the unskilled labouring class. The infant mortality figures for 1932 in these two layers of society were 32 per thousand and 84 per thousand, and in a depressed area they rose to 100. Children are the potential wealth of the nation and women must demand the means of safeguarding both their own health and that of their babies. A better standard of living and social security are the basis of this.

To free women for employment and for public life there must be ample provision of crèches and nurseries and of communal feeding and a rapid extension of school feeding. Only by releasing women from the drudgery and the constant ties of the family will they be free to develop to the full and make their contribution to society.

But all women are not yet aware of the fuller life that lies before them. Often when canvassing I have had the comment from the women, "I don't understand politics." "I am not interested, so I leave it to my husband." But the mothers of young children, especially those who have had a war job, are anxious about the future for those children and are interested in finding out what they can do to ensure peace so that their children may have the chance to live. With this interest comes the realisation that women cannot be passive and leave it to the men, but must take part in the struggle.

**They are the Majority**

Women must vote. Women are in the majority and therefore they are the decisive factor in the next election, as the French women were in theirs. The women of France, having suffered from the Nazi occupation of their country, understood the value of united struggle to achieve victory over the enemy and at the municipal elections cast their vote overwhelmingly for the progressive candidates. The women of England won the vote in the last war. In this war they have the responsibility of exercising that vote for the progressive candidate, and not only their own vote, but the proxy vote for their men folk in the forces. By voting for the progressive candidates they can ensure the return of a Labour, Communist and progressive majority and thus defeat the reactionary Tories whose policy between the two wars brought misery and suffering to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

millions. A Labour and progressive Government in which Communist members can play a part will help women to maintain the status they have achieved in the war and make possible the advance to complete equality with men.

Thus together will the men and women of this land advance to Socialism.

# Demands of The Forces

## by CAPTAIN W. ALEXANDER

*(Communist Parliamentary Candidate for Coventry)*

DURING the next few weeks there will be many statements on what the servicemen are supposed to be demanding. But, because of Churchill's rush election manoeuvre they themselves will have little opportunity of pressing their real demands through the ballot box.

### Voting Confusion

The Forces can vote in two ways—by the postal vote, whereby the election addresses of all candidates are sent out and then the voting paper is sent direct to the Returning Officer, and by the proxy previously appointed who votes at the polling station in the constituency. Many units have not completed the postal voting arrangements, especially those BLA and CMF units recently engaged in active operations. Those of the Forces who completed their proxy vote application (B2626) before March 15 will have a vote cast for them, but owing to the short notice of election, will not be able to receive the election materials, consider them, and then mandate their proxy. The confusion between the two forms of voting and the disenfranchisement of many is causing grave disquiet and can only lead to a desire to present Service demands in other ways. For many years army education has emphasised the importance of every man exercising his democratic rights by voting—Churchill takes away those rights in the interests of the Tories.

It is significant that the British Legion at its Whitsuntide conference showed the progressive feelings of servicemen of this war. Traditionally organised by senior ranking officers and "non-political" in the approved Tory style, it repudiated "anti-foreigner" resolutions and gave prominence to ex-ranker delegates. The Whitsun Labour Party Conference, too, felt the force of Service demands. Many of the worth-while speeches were made by young servicemen and the Executive suffered its only defeat when the delegates decided that Service gratuities should be paid on a flat scale.

### Higher Pay

A basic demand of the Forces is still higher pay. The increase in price of basic commodities like coal and potatoes, cutting of rations while unrationed foods are at exorbitant prices demand an increase in pay and family allowances to maintain living standards, let alone raise them from the existence level of war years. The Tory persistence in excluding the children of servicemen from family allowances provoked real resentment. It is agreed that this Bill, suitably amended, must be reintroduced, but only a Labour and progressive government can be relied upon to do so. Partial demobilisation and cutting of other war expenditure has knocked the bottom out of the Tory plea that the nation cannot afford increases. Further, with approaching demobilisation, a low level of Service pay is a menace to all wage levels: Service rates will be an optimum for wage-cutting employers. The basic rate of pay must be raised to 5s. a day,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with increments for service and proficiency, and as well, a proportionate increase in dependants' allowances.

**Demobilisation**

The problems and prospects of demobilisation are discussed everywhere. The Forces want to go home, but there is a firm acceptance that fascism has to be defeated politically and morally, as well as on the battlefield. The British troops are not occupying Germany in a passive, mercenary attitude—they are watching with keen interest for the complete elimination of Nazi influences and the emergence of popular, democratic forces—for only then can they return home. VE day fever did not infect the Forces. There is general indignation at the treatment of Goering and the Flensburg gang, for this policy can only encourage those who seek to keep fascism in being. The solicitous care for German officers' welfare has contrasted sharply with the rather brusque suspicious treatment of displaced persons and prisoners of war of allied nationalities. Bevin's plan for demobilisation by age and service groups is generally accepted as fair, but everyone is anxious that it shall be speeded up.

The British forces needed in the Far East can be greatly reduced by getting the support and co-operation of the Indian, Burmese and Malayan peoples, reversing the oppressive policies pursued by Amery. The Army of Occupation can be kept at a minimum by a vigorous policy, assisting the decent elements among the German people so that any "Werewolf" activity is resisted by popular feeling.

When Bevin was Minister of Labour there was confidence that Class B demobilisations could not be used to help those with influence or pull. The Ministry of Labour must not become a hunting ground for Tory wanglers and wirepullers. The political maturity of the Forces is indicated by the demand that all building trade workers should be sent home under Class B. They accept longer service overseas if the country's building programme goes forward.

**Gratuities**

The Government's gratuity proposals were greeted with general abuse because of their inadequacy. A private with four years' service nets £30, a sergeant £42, in marked contrast to the £335 drawn by a Canadian private with three years' overseas service. Presumably Service gratuities are intended to assist re-establishment in civilian life and to be comparable with possible savings if they had remained in civilian life. With existing prices of furniture, houses, etc., gratuities must be raised to several times their present level, while the Labour Party Conference has made out a strong case for a flat rate of gratuities, no matter the rank.

**Pensions**

The miserly and bureaucratic approach to serving men and their dependants who are entitled to pensions is a matter of concern. Those who have been disabled must be cared for, trained and then given an adequate pension so that they can live in security and free from the odour of charity. The dependants of the fallen must be cared for: they have made sacrifice enough without undergoing privation. All pension rates must be increased. Local pension boards, incorporating members of the Forces and members of municipal bodies, would prevent many injustices. Only a liberal financial policy of the Government can change the situation by raising all pension rates, but the Tories' record has been generosity in flag-waving and backslapping and parsimony in pensions.

**Democratic Discussion**

Frequently the Forces are discontented with ABCA discussions—they have found that discussion without action is sterile. Many an A.E.C. lec-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turer has been confused by demands for action by resolutions and petitions to support agreed opinion. This feeling must be encouraged: it is the guarantee of democracy. In this interim period between military and civilian life there must be a relaxation of those King's Regulations, so carefully cherished by the Tories, which have cut the Forces off from political and democratic life. Political activity must be freely permitted: there must be facilities to hear, discuss and canvass the views of all parties. Full participation in Parliamentary and municipal elections must be encouraged and voting procedure simplified so that those who fought for democracy have an opportunity to practise it. Representatives of the trade unions must visit the Forces, especially the vocational training centres, to explain the responsibilities and advantages of trade union membership.

**Jobs and Training**

Shall I get a job ?—that question is never far from the Forces' mind. There is a cynicism and distrust of promises. Training schemes and elaborate machinery for reinstatement in pre-war jobs will not dispel this.

It is obvious to all that without expanding industry and full employment these are illusory solutions. The official schemes for prevocational training have not been well received. Forces' education is littered with unfulfilled plans. But the industrial future of our country demands a big influx of skilled labour from the Forces. The training plans must be carried to their fulfilment by unit commanders, checked in the same manner as any operational order. The men demand the highest standard of training—they do not want to become a reserve of semi-skilled labour used to reduce wage levels. Close contact with the trade unions can ensure that the trainees become craftsmen entitled to the full rate and able to add to the nation's store of ability and skill. Factories, workshops and machines are available in Germany. There are competent technical instructors in the Army, Ministry of Labour and industry. If training centres are set up in Germany the trainees would still be available for possible military use and the shortage of consumers' goods demand we get the maximum peace-time production as soon as possible.

The Forces have these specialised demands, but they know they cannot be met as something separate and apart from the demands of the whole British people. The Services won't fall for attempts to put them in opposition to those whose contribution to victory was at home, in the factories and fields. They demand special consideration only to allow them to retake their place in civilian life. They know that jobs for the Forces are only possible if there is full employment for all, priority housing can only be part of a national rehousing programme, security only if there is security for all.

**Tory Responsibility**

The Conservative attempts to pose as special champions of the Forces will fail: 1945 is not 1918. Eighteen years of Tory misrule and mismanagement of the Land Fit for Heroes to live in, Tory responsibility for the growth of fascism, Tory opposition to increases in pay, pensions and gratuities, Tory hostility to the Soviet Union, have all educated the Forces. They realise that only a government based on a labour and progressive majority can guarantee them the fruits of victory.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Tory Foreign Policy

## by R. PAGE ARNOT

**" They ran a foreign policy which nearly brought us and the whole of civilisation to the dust."—*Ernest Bevin at Leeds, April, 1945.***

WHENEVER the guilt of Tory foreign policy is mentioned, some unblushing writer in the millionaire press is found to retort that the opinions of some Labour or Liberal politician or periodical were just as much to be blamed. What a brazen falsehood! What a barefaced attempt to evade the issue! Foreign policy is not a series of opinions. Foreign policy is expressed in a series of actions. For these actions the Foreign Secretary and the Government of the day are responsible. For these actions they must answer at this Grand Assize of the nation, must plead "guilty" or "not guilty." From this responsibility they cannot escape by recounting what some one else, whether friend or critic (and especially one of the party which is not in office) is reported to have said. It is neither evidence for them nor against them: it simply has nothing to do with the case. The authors of that foreign policy cannot shuffle off this responsibility. They are on trial for their actions, for the deeds they have done in their years of office up to 1940—as well as in these recent weeks.

### Anglo-German Naval Treaty

It was a Tory Foreign Secretary (no other than Sir Samuel Hoare) who was responsible, ten years ago this month, for rushing through with Ribbentrop the Anglo-German Naval Treaty. This treaty gave the Nazi government the right (forbidden by the Treaty of Versailles) to build those submarines which afterwards sank fathoms deep so many British ships and crews. It actually, in black-and-white, allowed the Nazis to possess the same number of U-boats as the total of British submarines. The French Government protested at this glaring breach of existing treaties,* but were calmly told that their protest came too late. It is not too late now for the merchant seamen of this country, or their widows, to enter into judgment on that disastrous policy.

### Non-Intervention

It was the Tory Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, who nine years ago adopted the despicable "non-intervention" policy, which denied to the constitutionally-elected Government of Spain its rights in international law and so allowed the rebel general Franco to be supplied with troops and munitions by Hitler and Mussolini in order to strangle Spanish democracy and defeat "the common cause of all advanced and progressive mankind." The Nazis were given the opportunity to practise on Madrid and Guernica the bombing methods they afterwards used upon Coventry and many other towns.

These are only the first two counts in the long indictment of Tory foreign policy "which nearly brought us and the whole of civilisation to the dust."

This past record alone would be sufficient to make the British elector look with misgiving upon a prospect of Tory foreign policy in the years to come, whatever professions of a changed outlook they may now utter.

But where is the proof of a changed outlook? Of course, during the period of the coalition from May, 1940, to May, 1945, amid the stress of war,

* Article 191 of the Treaty of Versailles ran as follows: "The construction or acquisition of any submarine, even for commercial purposes, shall be forbidden in Germany."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there were many in the Tory ranks who had the discretion to sing dumb—Captain Ramsay, M.P., had not been, and is not now one of those very discreet Tories. While the official policy of the Coalition Government, voiced by Churchill, necessarily stood for the maximum unity of the three chief allies and while the military situation was still tense and serious, some Tories who were last heard yelping with delight over Munich, were now as quiet as dumb dogs.

But just as soon as the end of the war appeared in sight, their voices were heard once more—against the Greek Elas, against Tito, against the Soviet Union. In place of the earlier solitary snarling of a few journals and newspapers, which had not been ashamed to echo the propaganda of Goebbels, there was now a powerful chorus.

### Lord Dunglass

This was heard at its maximum in the House of Commons at the end of February, when the Crimea Conference declaration was being debated. On the Crimea decision in regard to Poland, twenty-two Tory M.Ps., voted against their own Tory Party leader, while Lord Dunglass and many more significantly abstained from voting.

When the new Tory administration was formed in Whitsun week, lo and behold, Lord Dunglass was pushed into the position of Under-Secretary in the Foreign Office! His appointment was a triumph for reactionary circles, and must have caused joy to the Polish landlords in London, who hoped it was the thin edge of a wedge to split the Allies.

### The Szlachta

Here it is to be noted that a new and sinister factor has entered British politics, the influence of the Szlachta. The Szlachta, as the Polish gentry are called, have unblushingly used the millions given to them by the British and American Governments for purposes of internal propaganda, while their close connections with the most reactionary sections in this country and abroad have enabled them to put a finger in every pie. The Szlachta endeavoured to prevent Roosevelt's election in the United States, and in this country they successfully achieved the unprecedented interference of the Scottish Roman Catholic bishops on the Crimea decisions. Their agents are carefully placed in positions where they can exercise the maximum influences, including many journals apparently concerned only with British economics and politics. But above all, in foreign policy, the Szlachta work hand-in-glove with the most reactionary Tory circles.

A careful examination of the last few months, and still more of the last few weeks since victory in Europe, would give little hope that these influences within the Tory Party are enfeebled. On the contrary, they have grown. What they may grow to is in the future the big question-mark which every voter should have in mind.

### Significant Facts

Notice these significant facts. As soon as the liberation of France was interpreted to mean the end of the war in Europe in the late autumn of 1944 (General Marshall's article in the United States *Army and Navy Journal*) the decision was taken to send British forces to Greece, where they operated against ELAS. As soon as victory in Europe was won, and when only a few days were past, the Prime Minister made a speech which fell far below what was to be expected from the victory over fascism: it was gloomy about the future of Europe, it was critical of the countries liberated from fascism; the tone towards the Soviet Union in particular was cool.

As soon as the German armies in North Italy had capitulated and the Yugoslav Army had liberated Trieste from fascist rule, Field-Marshal Alex-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ander (whose political record is that twenty-five years ago he was the officer chosen for the political-military task of suppressing the revolutionary working-class of Latvia) was insolently referring to Marshal Tito's actions as "all too reminiscent of Hitler, Mussolini and Japan. It is to prevent such actions that we have been fighting this war" (May 19, 1945)

and it can be taken for certain that there was political inspiration behind his attitude.

It brought a merited reproof from Marshal Tito, who said:—

"I cannot but express my resentment and surprise at the impossible comparison that the presence of the Yugoslav troops in Istria and the Slovene littoral is similar to Hitler's, Mussolini's, and Japanese methods of conquest. Such an accusation can only be thrown into the face of an enemy, but not on to a tortured and bled-white ally which, until now, was recognised by all the freedom-loving peoples as an example of heroism and self-sacrifice in this great war of liberation."

### The Flensburg Scandal

As soon as the surrender took place in North-West Germany, there began a shameful fortnight, when Doenitz was allowed to strut about freely, when Count Schwerin von Krosigk was able to utter over the wireless his Nazi propaganda against the U.S.S.R., when Field-Marshal von Busch and the rest of the gang at Flensburg remained unarrested. This (and Goering's "reception" to journalists) which must have caused acute anxiety to our Soviet allies, had to be stopped: the people of this country would not stand for it. According to the B.B.C. commentator on Monday, May 28, Field-Marshal Montgomery had been strictly forbidden to take charge at Flensburg, where he could end this disgusting business. Forbidden by whom? Obviously, again, the inspiration of such a veto was political.

How is all this to be summed up? Clearly, it means a definite switch towards an older attitude in foreign policy. It means that in certain circles there was never a war against fascism, but only a war against Germany as the main power in Europe—the age-old policy of "the balance of power"—as indeed, it had earlier been expressly stated by the late Lord Lloyd with the full approval of the Foreign Office. The logic of that outlook, already visible last summer in Churchill's fulsome compliments to the fascist Franco, was seen when the British Government at San Francisco, in opposition to the U.S.S.R., voted to bring fascist Argentine in amongst the peace-loving nations.

### Balance of Power

But the logic of it, if pursued, goes to the point of undermining not only the anti-fascist decisions of the Crimea Conference "to root out every vestige of fascism" but also the whole basis of Anglo-Soviet friendship and the friendship of the three chief powers on which future peace depends. For the Soviet Union is now the "main power on the continent" of Europe: and the old "balance of power" argument, if dominant, must lead towards at first coolness, then quarrelling, and finally hostility.

Let no one imagine this is a fancy picture of lurking potentialities. It is precisely what happened a quarter of a century ago. No sooner was Germany defeated than France began to be regarded as the "main power on the continent," against which, to restore "the balance of power" (as well as for anti-Soviet purposes) Germany had to be raised up again. And so the process began which, through the operation of a Tory foreign policy, led finally to Munich seven years ago.

Since then different conceptions have grown up, a great alliance of the peace-loving nations was formed, and the basis laid for collaboration in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace as in war. But in 1945, and especially since the closing weeks of the war in Europe, reactionary hankerings after the old Munichite outlook are already obvious. Is the Tory dog returning to his vomit?

These present and future dangers lurking in a Tory foreign policy, and the signs already of a swing to the Right, are amply borne out by the change in tone of the press, which as a result of war-time conditions (Ministry of Information and the horde of public relations officers) now responds with remarkable alacrity to "atmospherics" produced in Foreign Office circles or in the Chancelleries of certain European governments. While the need of alliance and friendship continues to be mentioned, often in so perfunctory a manner as to make it sound like a pious aspiration, incidents which can cause friction are stressed, given undue prominence in headlines and generally speaking inflated. Especially is this so when the incidents have no basis in fact, as was the case of Bornholm. (*See page* 218).

### Talk of "the Next War"

What effect can come from this treatment of an ally whose armed forces have suffered casualties ten-fold greater than British losses? Does it not bring grist to the mill of these reactionary circles who, hand-in-glove with the Szlachta, are plotting to split the allies and precipitate war?

In this country, and in the U.S.A. true heirs of Goebbels and Himmler are to be found, busily whispering into ears that have been attuned to them by this criminal levity of Tory journalists. Witness H. G. Wells:—

"There is, I know, a systematic whispering campaign that the *next war* will be of Anglo-America against Russia. It is far too uniform in its phrasing to be unorganised." (*Letter to the Daily Worker*, May 24, 1945.)

Witness in the same week, while the new Tory administration with Lord Dunglass and all, was coming into being, Kingsley Martin from San Francisco telling of

"propaganda whose object—let us have no illusions in the matter—is to provoke war against the U.S.S.R. The London Poles openly talk about a third world war, which they expect within a very short time." (*New Statesman and Nation*, May 26, 1945.)

"*Which they expect within a very short time.*" This is the fetid atmosphere, less than a fortnight after victory over fascism in Europe, in which these persons carry on their poisonous intrigues. Yet the London Poles, expecting a third world war "within a very short time," and, on Mr. Eden's decision, still lavishly supplied with money from the British Government, are only one element, albeit a dangerous element, in the reactionary circles which support the Tory Party and aim to mould the Tory foreign policy. To what length they will go, and with what success, remains to be seen. But they have gone far enough already to make the voters shrink from the prospect of a Tory foreign policy.

### Foreign Policy an Election Issue

These significant facts of the last few weeks, together with the change of tone in the press, have to be set against the public professions of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden, in order to obtain a balanced picture of likely developments. Tory foreign policy in the past, from Eden's "non-intervention" farce up to the crowning infamy of Munich, is certainly not to be forgotten. What is more important for the immediate future are these ominous signs that could lead to the old "balance of power" in Europe. And, so far from foreign policy being a question aloof from the general election issues, it might turn out that this general election was forced now partly in the hope of getting a mandate for Tory foreign policy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The China Policy of Churchill—& others

## by ARTHUR CLEGG

ONE significant phrase in Churchill's first broadcast election speech has largely escaped attention. Speaking of the war against Japan, he declared his policy to be "to go out and finish off, at the side of our American brothers, the Japanese tyrants at the other side of the world."

Listening to this, one would not have thought that the Chinese people, who number some 450 million, had any concern with the war against Japan; that they had been fighting Japanese tyranny for some four years before the British Government discovered that the rulers of Japan were tyrants who needed finishing. Nor would one have thought that China is one of the five pillars on which the peace of the world must necessarily rest.

Listening also one was reminded of similar voices, the *Empire Review*, for example, which wrote in March, 1942: "The Malays, the Burmese and many Pacific islanders have seen the white man giving ground before yellow. . . . Such being the case, the overthrow of Japan by Chinese armies would do little to re-establish the prestige of the white man in the East. . . . Those who have seen the white man chased by the yellow must be afforded the same spectacle of yellow men being chased by white."

Churchill's accent is a little different, but is the voice essentially different? Or the real consequences of the phrase any less disastrous?

During recent years, compelled by world events and by pressure of non-Tory elements in the country, Parliament and the Government itself, British policy towards the Far East has risen to levels higher than anything previous, but in his first broadcast speech as a Tory leader Churchill reverts immediately to the policy of the past.

In examining the roots of this policy one can distinguish various elements—desire to exploit, fear of the Chinese people, and complete and callous indifference to either the hopes or the sufferings of so large a section of humanity. All of which run completely counter to those policies of friendship with other peoples of the United Nations which are the need, as well as the wish, of the people of this country.

Examples of these roots of policy are many. Chamberlain, in the House of Commons debate in November, 1938 (a year after Japan had invaded central China), said: "China cannot be developed into a real market without the influx of a great deal of capital, and the fact that so much capital is being destroyed during this war means that even more capital will have to be put into China in the future, when the war is over. Who is going to supply the capital? It is quite certain that it cannot be supplied by Japan. Therefore, when the right hon. gentleman (Attlee) appears to contemplate a future in which Japan will have the monopoly of the Chinese trade, and we shall be excluded from it altogether, I say this is flying in the face of facts" Here is the element of exploitation

An example of the "fear of China" element was furnished recently by a British field marshal of Indian fame who, when a visitor was trying to persuade him of the need for a united China in the modern world, replied: "Why should we want a united China? There would be no holding the Chinese once they all get together."

As for indifference, one can add the above together, and remember that Chamberlain was speaking after the rape of Nanking.

One can trace the policy itself through the history of a century. It led, for example, in 1902 to the Tory Government of that day making an

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alliance with Japan, which alliance was, until very recently, the foundation of Tory foreign policy in the East. Did not Churchill himself say, in February, 1933: "British interests require us to keep out of the quarrel which has broken out in the Far East, and not wantonly throw away our old and valued friendship with Japan"? Did not Sir Robert Craigie, British Ambassador to Japan, in March, 1940, in a speech made on the authority of Lord Halifax, then Foreign Minister, say: "Methods may differ, but both (Britain and Japan) are ultimately striving for the same objective"? And Churchill, in June, 1940, when he closed the Burma Road, China's life-line, talked of "a solution just and equitable to both parties to the dispute;" that is, equitable to the aggressor as well as to the victim !

Nor is this pro-Japanese aspect of Tory policy altogether dead today. At least one Tory M.P. publicly attacked the Cairo Conference decisions because they did not allow Japan to keep Formosa, while Simon Harcourt Smith wrote in the *Daily Mail* in March, 1944: "A privileged group of opinion in the City of London and in the House of Commons has lately begun to work for a compromise peace with Japan."

Along with the pro-Japanese consequence of the Tory attitude to China has gone active opposition to a united democratic China, the anti-Taiping policy, the efforts to split the Chinese national movement in 1911 and 1927. Since 1941 this opposition to Chinese unity, while partly overlaid by necessities, has none the less prevented any forthright expression of anxiety to see the emergence of a united democratic China (save in one partial case), and has led to championship of the most reactionary elements in the Kuomintang. Early in 1944, for example, General Ho Ying-chin, the leading militarist of the Chinese civil war faction, received a British military decoration. More, at the time of the Stilwell affair, and when criticism of the Kuomintang policy of maintaining China's disunity was strongest, Brendan Bracken issued a public statement defending the Kuomintang from criticism, and the Tory M.P., Reginald Purbrick, gave notice in Parliament to ask that General Stilwell be declared "*persona non grata* in any war theatre in which British army troops are engaged."

Our China policy, no less than our Soviet policy, requires to be cleansed by the coming election if a peaceful world is to be built.

# The Mare's Nest on Bornholm

## by OMEGA

AT the very end of the war in Europe Soviet forces liberated the Danish island of Bornholm, which lay within the Red Army's zone of operations. One week later a campaign against the U.S.S.R. was engineered from Sweden, a "neutral" which, at a critical stage of the war, in order to favour the Nazis, departed from a strictly neutral attitude and whose newspapers have been correspondingly vicious. The point is that this campaign appeared in the press of Britain, which is officially not a neutral, but a friendly ally of the Soviet Union. It is instructive to notice how this campaign swelled up.

On May 16 a little seed was sown under the heading "Danish Island Is Cut Off." On May 17 the *Daily Mail* correspondent from Stockholm, under the heading "RUSSIANS STAY IN BORNHOLM," began his cable: "It looks as if the Russians have come to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stay in the strategic Danish island of Bornholm. The Red Army has completely isolated the island for the past twenty-four hours," and went on to say that the Danish Resistance forces "are believed to have been disarmed, if not locked up."

The *Daily Express* went one better. Under a three-column headline in 48-point capitals, "MYSTERY ISLE BREAKS SILENCE," followed by a two-column "Dane hints at Soviet censorship," its Stockholm correspondent told of "the first phone call for twenty-four hours" and stated "Calls from the mainland to the island are still not being accepted; nor are cables. No ships are leaving the island: air traffic is cancelled." Then came the horrific sentence, quoted from the Stockholm newspaper, *Aftonbladet*: "An officer of the G.P.U. is there, too." Well, apart from the last-quoted piece of nonsense, it might have been a description of one of the Channel Islands, which was also in the process of liberation and de-Nazification. But this parallel was not drawn, nor is it what the newspaper meant to convey to its readers.

Other newspapers that day had such headlines as "Danish Governor still held," which actually referred to absence of air transport, but suggested an arrest, "Danish Island's Silence" and "Russians isolate Bornholm."

On succeeding days this "mystery island" was kept going in headlines such as "Russian Control of Bornholm" (*The Times*, May 18, 1945), "Bornholm No Longer Isolated" (*The Times*, May 17, 1945), "Russian Occupation of Bornholm" (*The Times*, May 21, 1945) and "Russian Purpose on Bornholm" (*The Times*, May 25, 1945). But in *The Times* letterpress admissions began to be made: that the Germans, following the instructions of Doenitz, had continued to fight for forty-eight hours after VE day; that Soviet aircraft had had to bombard two of the towns on the island; that Russians, assisted by Danish freedom fighters, were still rounding up; and, finally, that "Sweden is watching with concern events in Bornholm, which is only thirty miles from her shores."

This let the cat out of the bag. It had all been a Swedish anti-Soviet stunt. But this balloon was inflated by the treatment in the British press, and *the Foreign Office press section did not lift a finger to puncture it.*

Later, even the *Daily Telegraph* was quoting a member of the Bornholm resistance movement, who said that Swedish reports "are wildly exaggerated"; and by May 26 a correspondent from Stockholm had come to the conclusion that "The Red Army has not installed a single gun, or even manned the German coastal batteries. There is nothing to suggest that the Russians intend to stay in Bornholm or turn the island into a permanent base."

Later still, on May 30, when the inevitable Tory sucker got up in the House of Commons to ask "Is the right hon. gentleman aware of Swedish anxiety about the occupation of this island?" Mr. Eden made a significant admission in his reply:—

> I do not know anything about Swedish anxiety. I do not think their contribution to the Allied cause is great. So far as the Danes are concerned, the Danish Foreign Minister and a Danish delegation have been to Bornholm and have returned from there, and I understand that the relations between the Russians and the local authorities are reported to be cordial.

Cordial they might well be to their Russian liberators. But the press of Russia's British ally, which might have been expected to acclaim that liberation, was busy voicing the "anxieties" of those very doubtful "neutrals" of Stockholm: and Mr. Eden's attitude would have come better if it had been expressed a fortnight earlier.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

*Document of the Month*

# Communist Election Policy

THIS election has been rushed on the country by the Conservatives. They hope to gain a big Party advantage, because about a million servicemen and women, transferred war-workers and returned evacuees, the majority of whom would have voted Labour and Communist, will be deprived of a vote. By waiting only until October, all these people would have been able to express their views. The desire of the Conservative Party to get things all their own way, this contempt which they have shown for democracy, will not be lost on the people, especially those in the services.

But we believe the Conservatives, better known as Tories, have underestimated the mood and practical sense of the British people.

The people, now that they have beaten Hitler and Mussolini, want to go forward to a new and better Britain, which their victory has brought within their reach. They do not want to return to the conditions of 1939, to the unemployment, lack of good houses, derelict areas and insecurity from war.

Their wages, jobs, homes and chance of living a full and happy life, instead of merely existing, depend on how they use their vote.

If the Tories remain in power, your willingness to work will remain unused; your country's resources will be swallowed by the profiteers; the factories you built and paid for with your taxes will be closed or sold to private firms; the friendship with Russia and the anti-fascist people of Europe, written in your blood and sacrifice, will be undermined.

Much more than the fate of a party or any individual depends on the result of this election. The fate of your country, and its place in the world, depend on winning a Labour and Communist majority.

No one man, or one political party, won this war. It took the work, skill and endurance of all of us, in uniform, war industries, civil defence and the merchant navy, and the housewives, as well, to win. It took all the help we could get from the Russians, the Americans and the resistance movements of Europe.

If Britain's rich men had been left to run this war, they would have lost it. They were incapable of providing the country with sufficient arms, or with strong and stable allies. The people rescued the country. They went to it, and compelled changes in industrial methods so that sufficient arms could be produced. They sent their Labour and trade union men into the Government to oppose the faint-hearts and friends of fascism, and to mobilise the country's man-power as had never been done before.

Shall all these efforts and all this great friendship between the nations now be wasted and thrown away, or shall we go forward, with the help of millions of friends in other countries, to reorganise our country and strengthen its position among the democratic nations?

## *Clear out the Tories*

The Tories are led and financed by monopolists and great landowners. They held power in Britain for all but two of the twenty years between the wars.

Examine their 12-point election programme, and there is not one reform the Tories are promising the people today, that they did not promise at the end of the last war. Not one was fulfilled.

They preferred to serve the interests of the rich at the expense of the poor. Under their rule, production and trade declined, unemployment spread, great industries like coal, steel and shipbuilding became derelict. Millions were unemployed, often for years together. When profits were at their height just before the war, half our people could not afford to be properly nourished.

The Tories say they stand for high wages and social security. But it was they who drove the Labour Government out of office in 1931 because it refused the bankers' demand to bring in the Means Test and cut the soldiers' and sailors' pay, the unemployment allowance, the Government expenditure on education and health.

The Tories say they will give the people good homes. But they cut down every generous housing subsidy introduced by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour Governments, and left the country badly housed.

The Tories claim they will lead the country to lasting peace. But in the pre-war years they played up to Hitler, Mussolini and Japan, built up fascism, refused an alliance with Russia, and paved the way for this war.

To the Tories belongs the shame of appeasement under Baldwin and Chamberlain, whom they supported even on the very day when he was thrown out, when Britain stood on the edge of disaster.

Today they are carrying on in the same old way, backing the rich against the interests of the people. A free hand is to be given to the landlords and building rings. Controls are to be taken off so that prices of the goods and food you need can be raised, and profiteering can go unchecked.

In foreign affairs, their policy is already giving new heart to fascist forces and sowing suspicion and hostility against democratic Europe and the Soviet Union —the old policy that leads to war.

The key to the future, therefore, is the defeat of the Tories, and the return to Parliament of a majority of Labour and Communist members.

We are convinced that the defeat of the Tories is necessary in the interests of the nation. The Communist Party will devote all its efforts in this election to this aim. In consequence, although we are able, because of our growing strength and support, to put forward a greater number of candidates, we have reduced the number of Communists who will be standing to twenty-two, to avoid, as far as possible, three-cornered contests. We believe that a group of Communist M.Ps. would play a key part in the fight to carry through the kind of policy the country needs, and that the state of feeling in the country makes a group of Communists in Parliament a necessary reflection of public opinion. In constituencies which we are not contesting, we shall give all our help towards securing a Labour victory.

The programme of the Communist Party, which is summarised in this statement, will be fought for in Parliament by its M.Ps. It is a programme which the next Parliament can carry through, and which will receive support from all progressive parties and from the great majority of the population.

The main measures of this programme are:

### *A lasting peace*

We will do everything possible to carry through the Japanese war to speedy victory. We must build a peace that will endure, through the firm, continued unity and friendship of Britain, America and Russia, and the establishment of a world security organisation. The Nazis and war criminals must be sternly punished, not treated as "friendly enemies." Nazism and German militarism must be wiped out once and for all. Every step to prevent Germany starting another war must be taken. To do this, Britain will have to work in unity with the peoples who have fought fascism, especially Russia, and the new democratic governments in Europe.

Freedom for India is not only an elementary measure of democratic justice. It would bring nearer by many months the date when victory can be achieved in the Pacific.

A Labour and Communist majority in Britain would be a great step towards a world partnership of all the free nations, united in their horror of war and their desire to win a better and fuller life for the common man.

### *Make Britain a land of plenty*

The resources of Britain must be planned and used to the full to meet the people's needs, as they have been used to meet the needs of war. The planning, the control and the drive that gave us aircraft and Mulberry Harbours can give us new houses, better food and clothing and more wages. It can wipe out poverty and derelict areas for ever.

*Housing:* Millions of houses must be built at top speed, and rents controlled at levels which the people can afford. The land must be nationalised. As a first step, land immediately required for housing should be taken over urgently by the Government. Prices and supplies of building materials must be controlled, and grants provided to ensure low rents and quick progress.

*Industry:* Prosperity can only be founded on efficient, cheap production by our basic industries. Therefore, the nation must own its coal-mines and power, its steel and inland transport services. Only then can it rescue these great industries

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the profit-grabbers and the price-fixing rings, bring their equipment up-to-date and provide model conditions for the workers employed in them.

The Bank of England must be nationally owned, and finance made to serve the plans of the nation. Capital must be directed to build houses before luxury flats, to help small farmers, modernise industry and build factories in the distressed areas, as it has been for war production.

These controls, compelling big business andmonopoly to work on lines laid down by the Government in the interests of the nation, will help the small producers and traders against unfair treatment by the big monopolists. They will mean more freedom and security for the individual by providing employment, good wages and an abundance of goods. War-time controls on the rights of the workers and trade unions must be ended as soon as possible.

*Jobs and Wages:* There is no need for unemployment. There is no limit to the work to be done in providing a better life for the people. What is needed is to see that the most urgent needs are met first, and that work is provided at good wages for all who want it.

Wages and pensions must be increased, and the 40-hour week and a fortnight's paid holiday made general throughout industry. There should be equal pay for equal work, and a £4 10s. minimum wage in every industry. The old age pensioners' claim for 30s. a week without means test should be granted withiut delay.

*Social Services :* A Labour and Communist majority in Parliament would pass laws providing every man, woman and family with social security for unemployment, sickness and old age. Health services would be rapidly improved, by the speediest establishment of health centres, and making the best medical attention available to all without charge. Educational standards would be greatly improved, the school-leaving age would be raised to 16, and equal opportunities would be given to all children to take technical or university training.

*Agriculture :* A Labour and Communist majority will make sure that full use is made of our agricultural land, and improved conditions given to farm workers and farmers. There will have to be guaranteed prices, with control of imports, special assistance to small farmers, improved methods of distribution and marketing, and better living conditions in the countryside.

*A Five-year Plan :* We have much leeway to make up in the equipment of our industries. Monopoly control, before the war, held our industries back, and reduced them to an out-of-date and ill-equipped condition. Using methods tried and tested in war-time, we shall carry out a Five-Year Plan to organise production and maintain full employment. The aim of the plan will be to modernise our basic industries, guarantee prosperity to the former depressed areas, and make full use of the resources of Scotland and Wales as well as England. The Plan will provide the housing needs of the people, a great increase of the kind of goods which the people require, and sufficient war materials for the offensive against Japan and the defence of this country.

This Five-Year Plan will cover the whole needs of the nation. Every resource, every industry, every person, will be called on to make it a success.

We are confident that, given an appeal of this kind, by a Labour and Communist majority, the people would respond one hundred per cent. to win the peace, in the same way as they responded when hearth and home were in danger.

*The Forces:* A Labour and Communist majority will fully recognise its duty to the men and women in the armed forces. It will raise their pay, pensions and allowances, abolish the privileges of the "Old School Tie," and give promotion by merit, as well as better educational, training and cultural facilities.

Now that victory in Europe has been won, demobilisation can be carried through speedily, taking into account the needs of the war against Japan and the Occupation of Germany. A Labour and Communist majority in Parliament will guarantee that ex-service men and women, as well as discharged war-workers, receive employment with good pay and prospects. It will give demobilised service people a square deal, with equal gratuities for other ranks and officers alike, and full opportunities for training for the jobs they want to take up. No dependence on charity—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the nation must do its duty by those who have done their duty by the nation.

*Democracy:* The people have played a great part in this war. They have become conscious of their strength, and have expressed themselves on more than one important matter of national or international policy. They have exercised democratic pressure on the Government and local authorities. This vigilance has done a great deal to stop profiteering and waste.

Now the people should take an even greater part in the running of this country. A Labour and Communist majority will be the first big step in this direction.

All wartime emergency legislation restricting civil liberty must go. The Trade Disputes Act of 1927 must be repealed. Anti-Semitic propaganda must be made a criminal offence. Electoral reform is needed, to ensure that the number of Members of Parliament of each Party corresponds with the total number of votes cast for that Party in the country. Votes should be given to all over 18.

*MEN AND WOMEN AND YOUNG PEOPLE:*

*You* have won this war.

You now have a chance to make certain that you also win the peace, and advance towards a Socialist Britain, ending poverty, unemployment and wars for all time.

**In every place where a Communist is standing vote for the Communist !**

**In every place where there is no Communist candidate, give your support to Labour !**

**End the domination of the Tories !**

**Forward to a new and happier Britain !**

# *Book Review*

## Communist Policy on Agriculture

*Agriculture, Planned and Prosperous*—A Programme issued by the Communist Party (C.P., 1*s*).

THE PUBLICATION on the eve of the General Election, of the Communist Party's proposals for the future of agriculture, is an event of great political importance. On June 6 Mr. Hudson, the Tory "caretaker" for agriculture, announced that it was proposed to reduce cereal crops by half a million tons, and to reduce substantially the acreage of potatoes. The Tories are losing no time in reverting to their pre-war policy of the restriction of agriculture in favour of the great vested interests.

This policy, published by the Communist Party, shows absolutely concretely and in detail what can be done to establish a really prosperous agriculture in the future Britain. It represents the most complete and authoritative statement yet issued by any organisation, and will be of the very greatest service to the whole labour movement.

At the outset, it is made clear that the aim of agricultural policy must be to serve the interests of the whole nation. There is complete identity of interests between the rural and urban population in the need for a prosperous agriculture. "We put forward our policy, not in the sectional interests of farm workers and farmers, in opposition to those of the urban population, but in those of the nation. . . . . Our case is based on the hard facts of the position of Britain in the post-war world." These hard facts are the world food shortage, the need of the people of Britain for an outstandingly better diet than pre-war, and therefore the need for the fullest utilisation of the resources of our own land for producing food for the people.

The first section of the programme answers the question: "What should British agriculture produce?" It proves, not by general arguments but in terms of crop acreages and livestock figures, that a further expansion of food production is possible; and it shows in detail how this can be achieved. The programme visualises the maintenance of the present acreage of crops for direct human consumption, and increased production of milk and of other livestock products in so far as they do not compete with milk. To achieve this result it will be necessary to plough up a further 3.75 million acres of permanent grass, at the same time sowing down a proportion of arable land each year as temporary leys.

National planning and control of agricultural production must be continued. This does not mean that bugbear of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

farmers, "Whitehall farming," but it is proposed that county agricultural committees should be set up on a new democratic basis, composed of equal numbers of farmers (including smaller farmers) and farm workers, together with a smaller number of technicians and scientists. A considerable section of the programme is devoted to the problems of the small farmers, and proposals are made for the organisation of producers' co-operation as the basis of prosperity for the small farmer.

One of the most valuable sections is that entitled: "The Land and its Equipment." Here the case for the nationalisation of the land, and the various arguments against it, are dealt with in considerable detail. The failures of the traditional landlord-tenant system are fully exposed, and it is shown how the problem of providing adequate capital for tenant farmers can only be finally solved by land nationalisation. At the same time wholesale nationalisation is to be avoided, and it is proposed that land farmed by owner-farmers should remain the property of the men who farm it.

On the basis of such an expansionist policy for a planned agriculture, the standards of life of the farm workers can be decisively raised. The Communist Party strongly supports the farm workers' demands for a minimum wage of £4 10s. a week, for shorter hours and longer holidays, for the abolition of the tied cottage, for decent houses with light and water, for improved education and social services for the countryside.

Other sections of the policy deal with marketing, and with agricultural education and research. The whole programme, 70 pages in length, closely argued and packed with facts and figures, builds up an unanswerable case for the planned expansion of British agriculture. It shows what the people can do with our land in Britain, if we take over control for ourselves.

MAURICE CORNFORTH.

# Publications Received

**BOOKS**

Patents for Hitler by Guenter Reimann (Victor Gollancz Ltd., 6*s*, 160 pp.).

Citizens of the World by E. J. Elliot (Frederick Muller, 5*s*, 81 pp.).

**PAMPHLETS**

National Insurance by T. S. Newman, J.P. (Hearts of Oak Benefit Society, 6*d*, 32 pp.).

From the Russian Revolution to Yalta by Pat Sloan (Russia Today, 6*d*, 24 pp.).

The A to Z of the Soviet Union, compiled by Alex Page (Russia Today, 1*s*, 42 pp.).

Soviet Sport by George Sinfield (Russia Today, 9*d*, 24 pp.).

Equal Pay. Evidence submitted by the Communist Party to the Royal Commission (Communist Party, 4*d*, 24 pp.).

Engineering Prospects and Wages. A Memorandum (Communist Party, 6*d*, 32 pp.).

Italy's New Path by Palmiro Togliatti. Foreword by Harry Pollitt (Communist Party, 3*d*, 24 pp.).

France Today and Tomorrow by Maurice Thorez (Communist Party, 3*d*, 24 pp.).

Yugoslav Refugees in Italy by Anne Dache. Foreword by Compton Mackenzie (Victor Gollancz, 6*d*, 19 pp.).

What Buchenwald *Really* Means by Victor Gollancz (Victor Gollancz, 3*d*, 16 pp.).

A Ballad for Britain on May Day by Paul Potts (Modern Literature Ltd., 1*s*, 16 pp.).

Austrian Martyrs and Heroes (Free Austrian Books, 1*s*, 16 pp.).

Inside the Empire. Information Series No. 1 (Colonial Information, 6*d*, 18 *pp*.).

The Martyrdom of the Czechoslovak Workers by Will Lawther (Czechoslovak, London, 9*d*, 32 pp.).

The Future of the Czechoslovak Germans by Hubert Ripka (Czechoslovak-British Friendship Club, 32 pp.).

**BOOKLETS**

Holiday Making and the Holiday Trades by Elizabeth Brunner (O.U.P., 2*s*6*d*, 65 pp.).

The Ex-Serviceman's Problem by Capt. F. J. Bellenger, M.P., and Capt. Raymond Blackburn, LL.B. (Frederick Muller, 1*s*, 64 pp.).

**WALL CHARTS**

U.S.A. No. 2. Agricultural and Industrial Centres (Pictorial Charts, 2*s*3*d*).

U.S.A. No. 3. The Machine Age (Pictorial Charts, 2*s*3*d*).

"Parliamentary Government" (Pictorial Charts, 2*s*).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# A Hint to Trade Unionists

## Repeal the Trade Disputes and Trade Union Act of 1927

THE Tory Party and its satellite Rosebery Liberals are pretending that the issues of this election can be boiled down to the slogan "Freedom versus Controls."

Freedom for whom? Controls for whom?

The millionaires and monopolists who utter the cry of "freedom" do not say that what is wanted is freedom for themselves, so that they may be free to profiteer out of a rise in prices when controls are lifted, free to make superprofits out of the people's needs.

Nor do they say that "controls" established by them over trade unionists must remain. But isn't that what they mean?

Here is an example:

There are eight million trade unionists, men and women, in this country.

Yet their trade unions are not free. They are tied down and fettered by the Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Act of 1927.

That Act of 1927 puts the trade unions under "controls" and restrictions that had not existed for generations. Unions of Government employees had their freedom taken away: they were not allowed to join the Trades Union Congress: post office workers and others were deprived of full rights as citizens. The whole Act is made up of restrictions and prohibitions and "controls" of this kind.

That Act of 1927 was passed by a Tory Government, with S. Baldwin as Prime Minister and Winston Churchill as Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Several times during this war trade unionists generally and in particular the General Council of the Trade Union Congress approached Winston Churchill to have this blot removed from the Statute Book.

Churchill, after some half-promises, put the question off for two years. He said that the Tory Party chiefs would have to be consulted.

At last, in the spring of this year, the trade unionists got their reply. A deputation, headed by Sir Walter Citrine, on behalf of the Trades Union Congress, again saw the Prime Minister.

But the Tory chiefs were in no mood for the sort of concessions they had talked about earlier in the war when the future was uncertain. The Prime Minister, himself the main author (with Baldwin) of this repressive Act of 1927, flatly refused to have it altered.

So the "controls" over labour are to be kept on by the Tories: and the "freedom" is to be reserved for monopolists and millionaires.

Vote Tory and you vote against the freedom of trade unionism.


## BOUND VOLUMES

Enquiries often come to the office for the older volumes of the LABOUR MONTHLY. Of the years set forth below, there are a few copies still available at the prices mentioned :—

| | each | | | | each | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1925 | £2 | 2 | 0 | 1935 | £1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1926 | £1 | 15 | 0 | 1937 | £1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1927 | £1 | 10 | 0 | 1938 | £1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1928 | £1 | 10 | 0 | 1939 | £1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1929 | £1 | 10 | 0 | 1941 | | 15 | 0 |
| 1931 | £1 | 5 | 0 | 1942 | | 15 | 0 |
| 1932 | £1 | 5 | 0 | 1943 | | 15 | 0 |
| 1934 | £1 | 1 | 0 | | | | |


PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPRINTING: READY JULY

**A History of**
**ANGLO-SOVIET RELATIONS**

W. P. & Z. COATES

**Foreword by Rt. Hon. Earl Lloyd George**

18s.

**U.S.S.R. Speaks for Itself**

6s.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

# A Call to Co-operators

Nottingham Congress outlined the co-operative movement's political policy in the following resolution at Whitsuntide:—

"Congress calls upon co-operators to work for the return at the next General Election of a Labour and Co-operative Government pledged to secure:—

1. Full employment of the nation's man-power and resources, and such public ownership and general direction of economic policy as is necessary to achieve it.

2. Social security and a comprehensive National Health Service for all citizens and their families.

3. A housing, building, and town-planning programme on a scale equal to the public need, and plans for its swift completion in order of urgency.

4. Such control over prices, production, and supplies of goods as is desirable to avoid delays in carrying out this programme.

Within the above programme, continued freedom for organised consumers and producers to achieve, through co-operative ownership and expansion, the improvement of their status and well-being as members of the community."

*Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED